skilled position, to live as long, and to enjoy a wholesome environment.

To identify the problem, however, is not to correct it. Too much of the so-called civil rights revolution, or protest movement of recent years in which militancy has often identified leadership—has been expended merely talking about the problems as if to enumerate our problems constituted their solution.

Obviously inequalities in opportunities based on past discrimination and injustices require some special programs that deal with target groups: compensatory education, equal employment opportunities, minority business assistance, and ghetto economic development.

But in the world today, policies and programs have broad application and implications. Inflation, devaluation, environmental control, rationing, price controls, etc., are just as much "Negro problems" as traditional civil rights and they are the concerns of all Americans.

Without denigrating special assistance programs let me discuss what I believe to be the broader methods of improving the economic status of Negro Americans at this juncture in our political and social life.

The late Whitney Young succinctly stated the Negro's dilemma in economic terms when he described the possibility of "Negroes with a mouthful of rights, living in hovels with empty stomachs."

If this is not to happen under modern technology, increased automation, and current economic policies much more than the bland cosmetic programs currently utilized is essential. Nothing short of basic structural transformations in our society are required.

This is not to suggest radical or revolutionary changes alien to our private enterprise system or social order. Rather it is a matter of guiding current but indistinct trends into constructive goals based on the American ideals of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

What are some of these trends and what can we do about them?

One is the development of a new meaning of work. Currently what seems to be the American standard of an 8-hour day or a 5-day week is no more sacred than the 10 or 14 hour day a few years ago. With proper development of labor productivity we can achieve shorter work hours, eliminating monotonous and demanding work details, and assure employment at adequate wages.

Our present concept of "work" is filled with contradictions and inconsistencies. The worth of a job is correlated with pay . . . although the garbage collector may be performing a much more constructive job than some executives. His pay is based on our low esteem . . . not his real worth. Certainly, we might build a better case for paying the garbage collector more money. The housewife—with all of her duties as cook, babysitter, housecleaning, shopping, laundering, maid, hostess . . . is not even considered a worker, unless of course she leaves her own household to do these things for others. Apparently "pay" makes the differsnce and on this basis the lady at home is considered "worthless".

We must organize work to meet human capacities as we train persons to perform productively to their maximum potential. Everyone is capable of something despite race, age, education, or physical make-up. Work must be fashioned to employ people . . . not to create shortages.

It has been demonstrated that the very young, for example (5 to 13 year olds) can be used in classrooms as aides or that the very elderly make good foster grandparents. Many functions in a hospital can be performed by non-professionals, etc. Entry level jobs can be related to career ladders, etc.

Such a changing concept would begin to bring into the economy the service of many persons—minorities, women and elderly . . . now excluded or underemployed . . . or on the basis of present concept of work, considered "worthless".

Thus far our planning both by the private sector and government has been based on technological considerations. We have ignored the quality of life or ecological factors. consequently, our vast resources of energy, metals, and other raw materials are running out while our human energies are not fully used.

It is significant that three of the ten largest industrial firms are oil companies and three automobile manufacturers, are users of fuel. We are literally driving ourselves from an economy of abundance to one of scarcity. No wonder we have an energy crisis.

Let me refer again to the Willhelm and Powell study made in the sixties, in their paper "Who Needs the Negro?" They concluded: "With the onset of automation the Negro is moving out of his historical state of oppression into uselessness . . . he is not so much economically exploited as he is irrelevant . . . the Negro's anxiety . . . will spread to others . . . as automation proceeds."

Already this anxiety is upon us as the energy crisis deepens and as our society changes from a dominant goods-producing work force to a dominant human service orientation.

This change is significant for those minorities and others who have become irrelevant in a massive goods-producing economy in which machines can do the work of the least educated and unskilled.

With the change, new opportunites, both employment and business, are opened in such human services as education, health, conservation, recreation, communictions and community development.

As opposed to industrial output, the question may be raised as to whether this trend will lead us into activities requiring public investment and public control (some might call it state socialism), or whether the numerous services in question can be provided by private instead of public agencies.

It is unquestionable that even more than now, labor-intensive, human services will favor "private businesses" of the smaller type especially in such personal services as health, child care, food, light construction, home beuatification, catering, personal grooming, etc. Just to mention a few of the less sophisticated opportnuities.

Also, there is a current trend to combine public and private activities through contract work in which such activities as pollution control, landscaping, cleaning public relations, etc., are done by private firms on behalf of public agencies.

The important thing is as we move away from the main reliance on major enterprise to the development of human services those persons and groups left behind in the American Industrial Revolution will have a second chance.

It is this second time around opportunity to be pioneers that could aid most the disadvantaged persons and communities that now suffer high unemployment due to automation and traditional handicaps of earlier discrimination and injustices.

The prosperity of these areas—and their economic development—depends on increasing the economic status of the residents. The consumer that business helps to get a spendable income becomes its customers.

Because of their late start, negroes were denied opportunities to obtain the experience, education, and skills to compete in the industries and professional fields. They were foreclosed in skills and trades and denied seniority in unions. They were unable to assembly the capital to undertake vast businesses.

Without denigrating the value of equal employment laws, it cannot be denied that our greatest progress is made in the atmosphere of an expanding economy.

Stating it another way: widespread unemployment stiffens the resistance and widens the gap between those "inside" and those—such as minorities outside trying to get in.

Facts speak eloquently on this point. Between 1964 and 1969, the negro family income gained on the white family income, from 54% to 61%. Since 1969—with high unemployment—the black income has dropped to 59% of white income. The loss is sustained, not by both but by blacks.

It is for this reason I believe that far more than civil rights legislation at this time, our greatest hope lies in such proposals as "full employment" in which both high levels of employment and business expansion are woven together to create new jobs in the primary labor market and to promote private enterprise activities that build a viable community structure.

In addition this means that job gains for blacks would not involve white losses, or that preferential treatment would be necessary to provide job opportunities. A legalistic form of equality despite its moral justification has not produced the results we anticipated. Its implementation and endorsement have lagged and its political support has eroded.

A full employment proposal to provide jobs for all willing and able to work was fully contained in the Murray-Wagner bill in 1945. It provided jobs for all with decent pay and opportunities for advancement. It contained a national commitment or a guaranteed right to such employment. As emasculated it finally became the employment act of 1946.

The present crisis demands that again we consider such a far reaching solution and alternative to current economic and manpower policies that are clearly not working in anybody's best interest.

Instead of forcing people into demeaning jobs or onto welfare why can't we provide jobs that are meaningful, socially constructive, and remunerative. And at the same time encourage business expansion, through proper incentives if necessary, to employ the millions whose services can contribute to high production, economic growth, and improving the standard of living of all Americans.

This idea may seem idealistic or even radical to some. In view of contemporary events: controls, devaluation, inflation, and energy crisis . . . nothing should shock our sensibilities or be immune from national discussion.

President Nixon in recent times has been photographed raising cocktail glasses with Brezhnev in the Soviet Union and eating with chopsticks in Red China. Apparently doing business behind the iron curtain and with the communist outweighs ideological differences.

It is surprising how fast we lose our bisses . . . when greenbacks change from white to black hands or vice versa—detente (they now have given it a fancy name). The relaxation of tensions is strongly supported by America's most powerful corporations, including General Electric, Xerox, IBM, and Pepsico.

Gene Bradley (formerly with GE, now a Washington public relations executive) is quoted as saying of detente: "it's a terribly exciting thing, moving out on the world and forging ties—raising the standards of living in the less developed world."

Perhaps, who knows, we can expect detente out of both business and humanitarian considerations, to help us raise the standards of the 85 million Americans in this country who live on incomes below a level of decency.

And in the spirit of detente, it is reasonable to presume—black and white—can apply

the high principles of doing business together in the field of race relations.

Let me again ask who needs the Negro? And this time to provide an answer. We might do well to consider the fact . . . that what impoverishes so many blacks also accounts for the low-income and loss in gross national product for a larger number of whites. Consequently what helps the Negro benefits others even greater.

Secondly, if we were to treat blacks as a national group for a basis of comparison with other people of non-Communist nations—their contribution to the gross national product rank among the top 10 nations.

Thirdly, the 22 million-person black consumer market—simply cannot be ignored by businessmen—large or small black or white.

Detente is indeed a viable progressive force for application on the American scene . . . as abroad. It simply makes good business sense—to say nothing of national security—for us to foster good will and cooperation . . .

Dear friends, let me say again how pleased I am to have returned to Shreveport and to receive such a warm welcome. Yours is a great city. You have the leadership and determination to progress. Now, allow me to end on this personal note with words from Carrie Jacob Bond's lyrics,

"For memory has painted this perfect day with color that never fades" . . .

Certainly, this day will always live in my memories and may God bless all of you and speed your progress.

HR 12080

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO STRENGTHEN AND IMPROVE OPERATION OF THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (5 U.S.C. 552)

(Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bipartisan bill to strengthen and improve the operation of the Freedom of Information Act. It is also cosponsored by other members of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee. This measure is what could be considered the final marked-up version of the legislation (H.R. 5425) on which the subcommittee held hearings earlier this year. We will meet after Congress reconvenes in January to formally report this clean bill to the full Government Operations Committee.

H.R. 5425 contained a number of amendments to the existing Freedom of Information Act (5 United States Code 552), enacted in 1966. H.R. 5425 was based on the results of extensive investigative hearings held by the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee in 1972. Those hearings and the attending Government Operations Committee report (H. Rept. 92-1419) disclosed serious deficiencies in the handling of information by the executive branch of the Government.

The deficiencies were not limited merely to obstruction of the intent and purposes of the Freedom of Information Act, but also included poor policy control of classified information resulting in massive overclassification with no concomitant declassification schedule and failure of the executive branch to provide needed information to Congress.

I have already sponsored legislation to address the security classification problem. That bill, H.R. 12004, would implement the recommendations contained in H. Rept. 93-221, unanimously adopted by the Government Operations Committee in May of this year. It was introduced on December 18, 1973, and my remarks explaning its provisions can be found on page H11668 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date.

The ranking minority member of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLENBORN), is also introducing bipartisan legislation today to insure a free flow of information to Congress. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of that measure.

As noted earlier, the bill I am introducing today makes a number of changes in the original measure, H.R. 5425. The original bill contained extensive revisions to the Freedom of Information Act, including a rewriting of a number of the permissive exemptions in subsection (b) of the act. During the five days of hearings held on H.R. 5425 in May of this year, persuasive testimony was given that dealt with the way in which the Federal courts were interpreting these exemptions in freedom of information cases. This subject was also discussed at length during the open markup sessions held by the subcommittee during this summer and fall. A majority of the subcommittee members have finally concluded that the best course to follow is to recommend enactment of a series of procedural amendments to the Freedom of Information Act, without substantive amendments to the exemptions as contained in subsection (b) of the act. We have concluded that the Federal courts have, after 6 years and well over 200 reported and unreported cases, adequately resolved many of the problems caused by the language in a number of the subsection (b) exemptions. We feel that the courts are, by and large, reflecting the intent of Congress in advancing the public's "right to know" and that changes in this subsection at this time might tend to confuse rather than to clarify and might close some avenues of judicial interpretation.

A description of the new FoI amendments follows:

Agencies would be required to "publish and distribute" their opinions made in the adjudication of cases, policy statements and interpretations adopted, and administrative staff manuals and instructions to staff that affect the public rather than merely making them "available for public inspection and copying," as provided in the present law.

Agencies would be required to respond to requests for records which "reasonably describes such records." This language is substituted for the term "identifiable records," which we discovered was used by the bureaucracy in many cases to avoid making information available.

Agencies would be required to respond to requests under the act within 10 days—excepting Saturdays, Sundays, and legal public holidays—after receipt of the request and within 20 days—with the same exceptions—on administrative appeals following denials to the requesting party. These time periods are the result of a 1971 study and recommendations on improving the operation of the act as adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States and would provide a positive mechanism to correct one of the most glaring deficiencies uncovered during our hearings—that of agency stalling and foot-dragging tactics to avoid public disclosure.

The Government could be required by the courts to pay "reasonable attorney fees and other litigation costs" of citizens who successfully litigate cases under the Act. This amendment is directed toward another major deficiency of the present law revealed during our hearings—the high costs to the average citizen when attempts to obtain records under provisions of the act are frustrated by arbitrary or capricious acts of the bureaucracy or by foot-dragging tactics. Such assessment would be at the option of the court and has been successfully used in numerous civil rights cases in past years.

Agencies would be required to file a responsive motion to citizens' suits under the act within 20 days after receipt. Under normal rules of Federal civil procedure, the Government is given 60 days to file such responses, although the private citizen has only 20 days to respond to Government motions; this amendment would plug a major loophole used by the Government and revealed in our hearings, involving cases where repeated filing of delaying motions by the Government stalled court consideration of Freedom of Information Act cases for as long as 140 days. Such stalling tactics make a mockery of the law and often make the information, if finally made available to the citizen, virtually useless to him.

A new provision proposed to section 552(a) would clarify the original intent of Congress in connection with the interpretation of the "de novo" requirements placed on the courts in their consideration of cases under the act. Such amendment is made necessary by the Supreme Court's decision in the case of Mink versus EPA, decided on January 22, 1973, when the Court held that judges may not examine in camera documents in dispute where the Government claims secrecy by virtue of exemption 552(b)(1), dealing with the national defense or foreign policy, and are not required to exercise such in camera judgment in cases involving exemption 552(b)(5), dealing with interagency or intraagency memorandums. The amendments make it clear that Congress intended and still intends that "de novo" as used in the law means that since the burden of proof for withholding is on the Government, courts must examine agency records in camera to determine if such records as requested by the plaintiff in a suit under the act, or any part thereof, should be withheld under any of the nine permissive exemptions of 552(b). It also makes it clear in cases where exemption 552(b)(1) is claimed by the agency, the Court must examine such classified records to see if they are a proper exercise of such Executive order classification authority and that disclosure of the information requested would actually be "harmful to

the national defense or foreign policy of the United States."

New Section 552(D) establishes a mechanism for congressional oversight by requiring annual reports from each agency on their record of administration of the act, requiring certain types of statistical data, changes in their regulations, and similar types of information.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the bill provides that these amendments shall take effect 90 days after enactment so as to provide adequate time for the executive agencies to promulgate necessary changes in their regulations and operational guidelines.

I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the Government Operations Committee will act favorably to report this important measure to the House early in the next session so that we may act promptly to enact these meaningful amendments to the Freedom of Information Law to make it a more workable and effective instrument to help restore confidence in our governmental processes.

DEEP OCEAN FLOOR HARD MINERALS ACT

(Mr. DOWNING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, early in the second session, I intend to introduce the Deep Ocean Floor Hard Minerals Act, which will promote the conservation and orderly development of the hard mineral resources of the deep ocean floor. This bill is similar in intent to H.R. 9, which I introduced at the beginning of the present Congress. However, the details of the bill have been substantially revised in accordance with the extended hearings that have been held on H.R. 9, together with hearings on the same subject in the 92d Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we are living in an energy crisis, which has been highlighted by the fact that certain foreign nations have decided to restrict the availability of their oil resources to the United States. Without getting into any discussion as to the merits of the resource policies of those countries, I would merely like to note that the United States cannot afford to rely entirely on the policies of other nations. We have discovered that when the perceived needs of differing nations come into conflict, even nations which have been considered "friendly" may not be entirely sympathetic to the national needs of the United States.

There is a similar situation which exists for the United States in its need for mineral resources. Despite the vast mineral resources available domestically, there is increasing evidence that the development of the domestic resources is not keeping pace with domestic demand. At the same time, this Nation is encountering steady increasing international competition in the acquisition of foreign raw materials.

In addition, expropriation, confiscation, and forced modifications of agreement have severely restricted the flow or increased the cost of some foreign materials and there is evidence that security of access to foreign minerals may increasingly be hostage to political accommodations unrelated to the best interest of this Nation. At the same time, there is an alternate source of mineral raw materials which are available to the United States in economically workable concentrations. That source lies in the ocean floor manganese nodules which are found in varying percentages up to several pounds per square foot and in varying assays. The prospect of realizing deep ocean mining is no longer illusory, but is now on the brink of reality. The purpose of this legislation is to bring that reality into being.

For the past few years, ocean mining technology has progressed to the point where private U.S. companies and foreign entities have become increasingly active in the ocean area. The foreign entities are often strongly and directly supported in their efforts by their governments.

The Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 affirmed that it was in the national interest to foster and encourage private enterprise in the development of economically sound and stable domestic mining, minerals, metal and mineral reclamation industries. The bill which I am introducing is consistent with that affirmation.

Domestic mining interests in the United States engaged in the evaluation of deep sea mining of manganese nodules, which could provide the United States with a secure source of supply of several minerals including manganese, cobalt, nickel, and copper, are at the stage where large investments must be made in order to achieve the capacity for commercial exploitation. At the same time, there are problem areas of a legal and political character which represent serious impediments to the domestic development of seabed minerals. President Nixon recognized this fact in his statement of May 23, 1970, in which he called for an interim policy to promote the orderly development of seabed resources, pending international negotiations to arrive at international solutions to the problem. This legislation is very similar to the thrust of his proposal.

The major objection to the enactment of legislation of this type, as developed during previous hearings, rests on the fact that the United Nations is also concerning itself with this problem area and it is a matter which is proposed for resolution at the Law of the Sea Conference which is expected to take place during the course of the next 2 years. While I am entirely sympathetic with the solution of this problem on an international basis, I am somewhat less than optimistic as to the date of final international solution. The matter has been under detailed consideration in the United Nations Seabed Committee, in both its ad hoc and permanent status, since 1967. The work of that committee has still not produced sufficient agreement to encourage optimism for the Law of the Sea Conference. In that regard, I sincerely hope that I may be wrong, but in the meantime, I firmly believe that it is now time for this Nation to make a decision on how long we should wait before we begin the utilization of these available minerals which our economy may desperately need in the not too distant future.

With the introduction of this legislation, and with additional hearings on its detailed provisions, I feel certain that we can solve a national problem and at the same time make adequate provision for merging our national efforts into whatever international regime may be agreed upon in the future, whatever the exact date of that accomplishment.

I am hopeful that both this House and the other body can give early and favorable consideration to this proposed legislation early in the second session of the present Congress. We have thus far delayed action for 2 years in order to enable the international community to reach agreement. It seems to me that it is now time to put the international community on notice that the time for debate and rhetoric is drawing to a close, that the United States intends to continue the development of its technology in this area, and that unless an international agreement can be reached by the end of 1975, the United States intends to take independent action to insure that deep seabed minerals are utilized to satisfy pressing needs.

(Mr. SEIBERLING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. SEIBERLING's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

RETIREMENT OF ANDREW E. RUDDOCK FROM GOVERNMENT SERVICE

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to recognize the outstanding contribution that Andrew E. Ruddock has given to Government service.

I first met Andy when he appeared to testify before the Appropriations Subcommittee on which I served years ago. The Congress was concerned at the time with the growing insolvency of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, and we were concerned with the long-range consequences of the escalating liabilities that surely would come in a relatively few years. I was impressed with his depth of understanding of complicated matters, and his ability to clearly explain and communicate this understanding.

In large measure through his efforts, at the urging of our committee and with the cooperation of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, legislation was enacted to place the Federal retirement program on a reasonably sound financing basis.

Mr. Ruddock is taking the retirement he has so richly earned at the end of this month, after 34 years of Government service, and his good counsel and

administrative ability will be difficult for the U.S. Civil Service Commission to replace. Without question, he is one of the Commission's most dedicated employees. In 1961 he was awarded the Commissioners' Award for Distinguished Service.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to recognize the dedicated service of people like Andy Ruddock to the Government and the Nation. We wish him our sincere best wishes for many years of full and rich retirement and service in other areas in the years ahead.

(Mr. BOLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

[Mr. BOLAND's remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ETHICS AND THE WHITE HOUSE TAPES

(Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that many Members of Congress shared my extreme distress over the recent revelation that a lawyer associated with the well-respected Ralph Nader played one of the subpoened White House tapes at a Washington cocktail party.

The lawyer in question has admitted the folly of his action, and I have no reason to believe that his regret is insincere. However, we do well to reflect on this incident, as it underscores the importance for everyone connected with the Watergate investigation to proceed in a responsible manner.

The President of the United States has articulated effectively the need to preserve the confidential nature of conversations which take place between the President and other individuals. Without this confidentiality, it would be exceedingly difficult for any President to conduct the business of the people.

It was shocking and distressing that this position, which I feel that most Americans consider to be reasonable, was eroded through the actions of a member of the legal profession.

In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely essential that everyone connected with the Watergate investigation conduct his business in a responsible manner, not just the President of the United States.

I am inserting the Associated Press story which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post which details this unfortunate incident.

NADER LAWYER PLAYS NIXON TAPE "FOR FUN"

A White House tape turned over to a Ralph Nader lawyer last week was played "for fun" at a cocktail party Monday night, ABC News has reported.

The tape was one of those the Ralph Nader organization had sought in its legal battles with the Nixon administration charging favoritism to the dairy industry in exchange for campaign contributions.

After fighting subpoenas for the tapes for months, the White House released this copy last week to attorney William Dobrovir, a Nader lawyer.

ABC News said Tuesday that Dobrovir played the recording at a cocktail party, but refused to play it for ABC Tuesday.

Nixon Press Secretary Ronald L. Ziegler said Dobrovir's action sounded unethical or illegal. A spokesman for special prosecutor Leon Jaworski expressed outrage, ABC said.

"That's just what we were worried about. Watch what the White House does with this now," the spokesman said. Dobrovir could not be reached immediately for comment.

COORDINATION OF THE FINANCING AND DELIVERY OF HEALTH CARE

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished and influential colleague and fellow member of the Public Health and Environment Subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Honorable Dr. William Roy, delivered a thought-provoking speech on national health policy before a meeting of the National Association of Blue Shield Plans on October 26, 1973, in Chicago. In his speech Dr. Roy, who often provides our subcommittee with alternate approaches and views on health issues, points out that for health reform to become a reality, greater coordination must take place between the financing and delivery of health care.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a copy of Dr. Roy's speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

Mr. Chairman and Mr. Krizsy, my distinguished colleague of the Senate, Senator Hansen, Ladies and Gentlemen: I am pleased to be here with you this morning. I have heard the jingle before about doctor, lawyer, Indian chief. I have also heard the rest of it, which is something about poor man, beggar man, thief—as I recall.

I appreciate Senator Hansen addressing me as Dr. Roy. I would be very comfortable if he addressed me as Bill. We all know it is a little difficult these days to be addressed as a politician. And I am well aware that physicians, thank God, for the most part still have the confidence of the people in the nation. Among the professions and occupations, physicians are well thought of by the people of this country.

I am often asked if I had any advantage going to the House as a physician, and I think I did have some advantage. I believe that because I am a doctor, the members of the House were somewhat curious to meet me when I went there three short years ago. I think, however, the Members of the House—who, as most of you know, are mostly male and mostly elderly—soon became disillusioned when they found out I was an obstetrician and gynecologist . . . and not a urologist. But you can't win them all.

I am pleased that I am not up here to represent, necessarily, the views of the House of Representatives, because I am uncertain what those views are. I am reasonably certain, however, that the views of the majority of members at this time do not concur with my views, and therefore I speak only for myself. I do not even claim to speak for the members of the Health Subcommittee, although I think that in a number of areas I will discuss there is a considerable sympathy in the House Health Subcommittee for the policies that I am going to state.

I have—over three years—begun to formulate some idea of what I think National Health Policy should be. This is a pretty presumptuous thing to do from several viewpoints, but primarily because as the junior man on the Health Subcommittee, I certainly do not have any power to implement the things that I think should happen; I have to rely primarily on the power of persuasion. And as one who used to be able to get by simply by saying "it's a boy" or "it's a girl," it is somewhat difficult for me to make long speeches. But, let me take a shot at it, relatively briefly.

I believe that there are about four pieces of legislation that could very well fit together to form a reasonably attractive package of legislation as we try to move toward a National Health Policy.

PSRO Legislation. I think the legislation which created the Professional Standards Review Organizations, a law which is already on the books, is probably a good law. We hope it will be implemented and administered in such a way that we will be able to conclude that it is a good law. I have had little part in it. In the House, we just received the proposal as a part of a Conference Committee report.

But I believe the PSRO law does address itself to quality, and I think we would be sticking our heads in the sand if we did not also realize that it addresses itself—to some degree—to cost. I believe we all believe that when the government is paying the bill, or when other third-party payers are paying the bill, it is reasonable to ask whether or not the contract between the patient and the health professional is a necessary contract. I also believe it is also reasonable to ask whether or not the care was proper care for the diagnosis made. My understanding is that this is what we are to determine with Professional Standards Review Organizations. It is also my understanding that the foundation movement in this nation has found that about 5 to 12 per cent of care was either improperly rendered or was unnecessary. So I would think we can anticipate some decrease in the cost of care with the establishment of effective PSROs.

HMO Legislation. I think the HMO legislation which is now in conference is reasonably good legislation. I believe it is proper for the federal government to assist Health Maintenance Organizations. I think it is good for the federal government to define what we now think a Health Maintenance Organization is, because this is such a protean term . . . it is presently difficult to define an HMO.

I think wherever there have been prepaid practices, the balance of the medical care system—the private fee-for-service physician, the private voluntary hospital, the corner pharmacist, and so on—has done a better job of peer review and a better job of utilization review. I have total confidence that the system as we now know it can, with certain changes, do every bit as good a job as an HMO. Of course, in many instances, it will do a better job with HMOs, since health maintenance organizations introduce an element of competition at the proper point for competition.

May I also observe that among health professionals there is presently a great deal of good will. I also think that there is a great deal of innovation going on among groups of health professionals, among provider insurance groups, and among the other health interest groups. I believe this is a good time to harness the good will and the innovative ideas. The HMO bill moves in this direction without putting anyone in a bridle or a harness in such a way they cannot continue to move with some freedom.

Regional Health Authority Legislation. I now would like to discuss an important proposal about which I have been speaking for several months. It is not law. Some of the elements I have been talking about probably will not become law, but a number of the